

1 MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 1200 2 COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1925 TELLIPHONE 7(+668-2400) FACSIMILE,714-668-2400 3 Steven J. Elie (State Bar No. 130566) s.elie@mpglaw.com 4 Donald E. Bradley (State Bar No. 145037) 5 d.bradley@mpglaw.com Sean A. Kading (State Bar No. 211540) 6 s.kading@mpglaw.com 7 Attorneys for Defendant, The Arnold Engineering Company 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE 10 11 ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, Case No. 04CC00715 12 Plaintiff, Complaint Filed: December 17, 2004 13 VS. Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Thierry P. Colaw in Dept. cx104 NORTHROP CORPORATION: NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION; AMERICAN VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED ANSWER ELECTRONICS, INC.; MAG AEROSPACE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO INDUSTRIES, INC.; GULTON INDUSTRIES, INC., MARK IV INDUSTRIES, INC.; EDO CORPORATION; FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT 17 MOORE BUSINESS FORMS, INC.; AC PRODUCTS, INC.; FULLERTON 18 | MANUFACTURING COMPANY; FULLERTON BUSINESS PARK LLC; and 19 DOES 1 through 400, inclusive, 20 Defendants. 21 22 The Arnold Engineering Company ("Arnold"), also known as "The Arnold 23 Engineering Company which has conducted business in California as The Illinois Arnold 24 | Engineering Co." and, for purposes of this answer, DOE 91, hereby submits its First Amended 25 II Answer to the First Amended Complaint of Orange County Water District ("Plaintiff"). Arnold's 26 answers to Plaintiff's allegations below are intended to apply to Arnold alone and do not speak to

28 | ///

485570.1

the actions of other persons or entities.

5

8

6

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

26

28

SUMMARY

- 1. Paragraph 1 contains statements of intent or legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 2. Paragraph 2 contains statements of intent or legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 3. Answering paragraph 3, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

PLAINTIFF

- 4. Paragraph 4 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 5. Paragraph 5 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 6. Paragraph 6 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

DEFENDANTS AND SITE HISTORY

- 7. Paragraph 7 contains definitions and legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 8. Answering paragraph 8, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.
- 9. Answering paragraph 9, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

///

485570.J

admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

5

8

9

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

25

24

2627

Z K, peeler

CHEMICALS OF CONCERN AND RELEVANT OPERATIONS

- 23. Paragraph 23 contains definitions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 24. Answering paragraph 24, Arnold admits that PCE and TCE are organic compounds that can be used as cleaning solvents and that PCE can be transformed into other compounds under certain conditions. Except as expressly admitted, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.
- 25. Answering paragraph 25, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.
- 26. Paragraph 26 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 27. Answering paragraph 27, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.
- 28. Paragraph 28 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Orange County Water District Act – Against all Defendants)

- 29. Answering paragraph 29, Arnold incorporates by reference its answers to paragraphs 1 through 28 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 30. Paragraph 30 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 31. Answering paragraph 31, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

- 32. Answering paragraph 32, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.
- 33. Paragraph 33 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 34. Paragraph 34 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 35. Paragraph 35 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Superfund Act – Against all Defendants)

- 36. Answering paragraph 36, Arnold incorporates by reference its answers to paragraphs 1 through 35 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 37. Paragraph 37 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 38. Paragraph 38 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 39. Paragraph 39 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.
- 40. Paragraph 40 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

1	41. Paragraph 41 contains statements of intent or legal conclusions requiring no			
2	response. To the extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks			
3	sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
4	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION			
5	(Negligence - Against all Defendants)			
6	42. Answering paragraph 42, Arnold incorporates by reference its answers to			
7	paragraphs 1 through 41 above, as though fully set forth herein.			
8	43. Paragraph 43 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
9	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
10	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
11	44. Paragraph 44 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
12	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
13	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
14	45. Paragraph 45 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
15	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
16	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
17	46. Paragraph 46 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
18	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
19	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
20	47. Answering paragraph 47, Arnold lacks sufficient information or belief to			
21	admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.			
22	48. Paragraph 48 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
23	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
24	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
25	49. Paragraph 49 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the			
26	extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information			
27	or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.			
28	///			

485570.1

26

58.

or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

extent the paragraph contains allegations requiring a response, Arnold lacks sufficient information

Paragraph 58 contains legal conclusions requiring no response. To the

or belief to admit or deny the allegations, and on that basis denies them.

28

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1	1 SECOND DEFENSE			
2	(Failure to State a Claim – Vagueness)			
3	2. Plaintiff has also failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted			
4	because the allegations against Arnold are vague and unintelligible.			
5	THIRD DEFENSE			
6	(Venue)			
7	3. Venue is not proper in this Court under the applicable forum statutes,			
8	including Section 394 of the Code of Civil Procedure.			
9	FOURTH DEFENSE			
10	(Standing)			
11	4. Plaintiff lacks standing to bring this action.			
12	FIFTH DEFENSE			
13	(Statute of Limitations)			
14	5. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by applicable statutes of			
15	limitations.			
16	<u>SIXTH DEFENSE</u>			
17	(Laches)			
18	6. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of latches.			
19	9 <u>SEVENTH DEFENSE</u>			
20	0 (Unclean Hands)			
21	7. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred as a matter of equity because			
22	2 Plaintiff has "unclean hands" or otherwise has engaged in conduct sufficient to bar its claims.			
23	EIGHTH DEFENSE			
24	(Estoppel)			
25	8. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of equitable			
26	estoppel.			
27	///			
28	///			
MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP	485570.1			
ATTORNEYS AT LAW	FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES			

l i			
1	<u>NINTH DEFENSE</u>		
2	(Waiver)		
3	9. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of waiver.		
4	TENTH DEFENSE		
5	(Exhaustion, Prerequisites, and Conditions Precedent)		
6	10. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred because Plaintiff failed to		
7	exhaust its remedies and has not performed all necessary conditions precedent or satisfied the		
8	jurisdictional prerequisites required prior to commencing this action, including those required		
9	under the California Superfund Act and the Orange County Water District Act.		
10	ELEVENTH DEFENSE		
11	(Failure to Join Indispensable or Necessary Parties)		
12	11. Plaintiff has failed to join all indispensable or necessary parties needed for		
13	the just and complete adjudication of the subject matter of this action.		
14	TWELFTH DEFENSE		
15	(Failure to Mitigate)		
16	12. Plaintiff has failed to mitigate, reduce or otherwise avoid its alleged costs		
17	and damages, if any. As a result, any damages awarded should be barred or reduced accordingly.		
18	THIRTEENTH DEFENSE		
19	(Comparative or Contributory Fault)		
20	13. Any purported damages to Plaintiff are the result of Plaintiff's own		
21	negligence and/or other acts or omissions. As a result, any recovery should be reduced by		
22	Plaintiff's comparative fault or degree of responsibility.		
23	FOURTEENTH DEFENSE		
24	(Intervening Acts and Proximate Cause)		
25	14. Plaintiff cannot recovery damages from Arnold because any such damages		
26	were proximately caused by unforeseen, unforeseeable, independent or superceding events beyond		
27	the control of Arnold, or otherwise unrelated to any actions taken by Arnold, including, but not		
28	limited to, an act of God, an act of war, or any other act or omission of a third party. No act or		
R			

1	omission by Arnold, any of its agents or any other person or entity working on its behalf, was the		
2	actual or proximate cause of the damages alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint.		
3	<u>FIFTEENTH DEFENSE</u>		
4	(Due Care and Compliance)		
5	15. At all times, all activities conducted by Arnold were carried out with due		
6	care and in compliance or substantial compliance with all statutory, regulatory and common law		
7	requirements.		
8	SIXTEENTH DEFENSE		
9	(Contribution/Indemnity)		
10	16. Should Plaintiff recovery damages from Arnold, if any, Arnold is entitled to		
11	indemnification and/or contribution, in whole or in part, from all persons or entities whose		
12	negligence, fault, or other conduct caused or contributed in any way to such damages. Arnold		
13	reserves the right to pursue any and all action against such persons or entities for contribution		
14	and/or indemnification.		
15	SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE		
16	(Divisibility)		
17	17. Should Plaintiff recovery damages from Arnold, if any, such damages are		
18	distinct, divisible and separate. Therefore, Arnold cannot be held jointly and severally liable for		
19	any damages not caused by it.		
20	<u>EIGHTEENTH DEFENSE</u>		
21	(Joint and Several Liability)		
22	18. Plaintiff fails to state a claim or allege facts that support a finding of joint		
23	and several liability against Arnold for any damages alleged in Plaintiff's Compliant.		
24	NINETEENTH DEFENSE		
25	(Offset)		
26	19. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are subject to an offset.		
27			
28 ER			
	.l		

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1	TWENTIETH DEFENSE			
2	(Unjust Enrichment)			
3	20. Plaintiff would be unjustly enriched should it receive the relief prayed for in			
4	its First Amended Complaint.			
5	TWENTY-FIRST DEFENSE			
6	(Punitive Damages)			
7	21. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are precluded, in whole or in part,			
8	by the California Constitution and the United States Constitution.			
9	TWENTY-SECOND DEFENSE			
10	(Due Process)			
11	22. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims under the California Superfund Act and the			
12	Orange County Water District Act violate Arnold's due process rights guaranteed by the			
13	California Constitution and the United States Constitution.			
14	TWENTY-THIRD DEFENSE			
15	(Preemption)			
16	23. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims under the California Superfund Act and the			
17	Orange County Water District Act are preempted by the Comprehensive Environmental Response,			
18	Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 et seq. (as amended).			
19	TWENTY-FOURTH DEFENSE			
20	(CERCLA)			
21	24. Arnold reserves the right to assert any and all defenses available to it under			
22	the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C			
23	§ 9601 et seq. (as amended) should the jurisdiction of that Act be triggered in this action.			
24	TWENTY-FIFTH DEFENSE			
25	(Invalidity of the North Basin Groundwater Protection Project)			
26	24. Arnold is informed and believes that on or about November 16, 2005,			
27	Plaintiff's Board of Directors approved a costly remedial plan called the North Basin Groundwater			
28	Protection Project (the "Groundwater Cleanup Project"), and that Plaintiff seeks in this action to			
ER .P	495570.1			

MUSICK, PEELE & GARRETT LLI ATTORNEYS AT LAW

recover all of the costs associated with implementing the Groundwater Cleanup Project from 1 2 Arnold and the other defendants. Defendant is further informed and believes that Plaintiff's 3 approval of the Groundwater Cleanup Project is invalid procedurally and substantively because, among other things, Plaintiff (1) failed to provide adequate notice of Plaintiff's consideration of 4 5 the Groundwater Cleanup Project to Arnold and the other defendants, (2) failed to permit Arnold and the other defendants to provide comments on the Groundwater Cleanup Project, (3) failed to 6 7 consider all chemicals present in the groundwater and their likely sources, (4) failed to consider 8 more cost-effective and feasible alternatives to the Groundwater Cleanup Project, (5) failed to evaluate the location and depths of extraction wells, and (6) failed to evaluate recharge of the treated water. 10 TWENTY-SIXTH DEFENSE 11 (Reservation) 12 25. Arnold reserves the right to assert additional affirmative and other defenses 13 during and following the completion of discovery and also intends to rely on any other affirmative 14 defense asserted by the other co-defendants in this action. 15 16 PRAYER WHEREFORE, Defendant Arnold prays as follows: 17 18 1. That Plaintiff recover nothing from Arnold by reason of its First Amended Complaint; 19 That the First Amended Complaint be dismissed in its entirety as to Amold, 2. 20 21 without prejudice; 3. That Arnold be awarded its costs of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees 22 incurred herein; and 23 24 /// /// 25 26 /// 27 /// ///

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP

14

1	4. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.		
2			
3	DATED: September, 2006	MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT, LLP	
4			
5		By:	
6		Steven J. Elie, Esq. Donald E. Bradley, Esq. Sean A. Kading, Esq. Attorneys for Defendant The Arnold Engineering Company	
7		Sean A. Kading, Esq. Attorneys for Defendant	
8		The Arnold Engineering Company	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP			
ACTION AND ADDRESS.	485570.1	15	

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

15 FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

I, Emi A. Donis, declare: Arnold Engineering Company. believe them to be true.

VERIFICATION

I am authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of Defendant The

I have read the foregoing First Amended Answer of The Arnold Engineering Company to the First Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff Orange County Water District and know its contents. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the States of California and Oregon that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this $6 \frac{\text{th}}{2}$ day of September, 2006 in Portland, Oregon.

Emi A. Donis

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PROOF OF SERVICE VIA LEXISNEXIS FILE AND SERVE

I, Wendy DeBoer, hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that a true copy of the following documents:

VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE

DEFENSES TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

was served via LexisNexis File & Serve on all parties in this action on September 7, 2006, at

Costa Mesa, California.

Wendy DeBper

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

485570.1